61. The need for remission of water-cess on certain Puravus in Kizhakara and for the construction of certain protective works.

Mr. N. Kumara Pillai (Member, T. I. C., Colachel) said that though Kodayar water was never let in to irrigate the Eanthili *yela*, Naduvil *yela* and the Kizhake *yela* in Kizhake Desom, Colachel *pakuthi*, the authorities had included those *yelas* also under lands for which water-cess was levied. Under existing arrangements, water could not be supplied to the lands in question as the channel had ended at a point about three-fourths of a mile away from them. Further, those lands did not stand in need of water, but were, on the other hand, suffering from excess of water from the Anantha Victoria Marthandavarma canal. The levy of cess must be due to a mistake on the part of the revenue authorities, as lands similarly conditioned in the same *pakuthi* and in the Agastisvaram taluk were not charged with the cess. He therefore prayed that the cess imposed on the lands, measuring 39·79 acres, should be remitted.

The Member next said that the surplus water from the above *yelas* had to escape through the A. V. M. canal, which also supplied the Colachel *alloms* with water. The *allom* authorities often put up dams to take in their supply with the result that the *yelas* would be flooded and much destruction caused to cultivation. He therefore requested that a culvert be constructed to regulate the flow of the surplus water to the canal, without detriment to the cultivation in the *yelas*.

Lastly, the Member prayed for the construction of a small bridge, 5 feet in width, across the A. V. M. canal, for the benefit of the numerous children going to the schools at Colachel and thousands of men and women going to the market and other places of business. He said that the subject had been brought up at previous sessions of the Assembly and that nothing had been done in the matter so far.

Dewan's reply.—Noted.

62. The need for changing the present system of supply of water through the Puthanar.

Mr. S. Lakshminarayana Iyer (Member, T. I. C., Padmanabhapuram) said that the Padmanabhapuram–Puthanar was the feeder of the Thiruvancode and Erattakara channels. The area directly commanded by the Puthanar comprised old and new lands. All the above lands bore a regular water cess. The Member's representations related to the difficulty of cultivating the above lands on account of the present system of water supply. Under the present system water was let into the Thiruvancode and Erattakara channels by turns. Sometimes water was let into the Thiruvancode channel for two or three days in a week and then into the Erattakarakal. At other times, water would be let into the Thiruvancode channel continuously for 7 or 8 days without supplying any water to the Erattakarakal. Even when water was let into the Erattakarakal, the sluices through which water could flow to the lands directly commanded by the Puthanar would be opened only after the water reached the lands at the tail end of the canal. The lands in question therefore got the water last, and two or three days after the supply began, the sluices would be again closed to let in water to the Thiruvancode channel. Thus the water supplied to the lands in question was quite inadequate, especially for the new lands. The cultivation, started soon after the first supply of water, withered on account of the sudden stoppage of water and the lands became dry. The lands remained in that condition for another 8 or 10 days till the next supply began.

Such a system brought great hardship on the ryots. The result was that the water supplied was barely enough to prevent *Kariru* or total failure of the crops and to justify the inclusion of the lands in question under the category of those which did not enjoy remission of tax on account of the supply of Kodayar water. The ryots were assured a supply of water for irrigation for all but two months in the year, once all the channels were opened. He therefore requested that, in the interests of cultivation, water should be supplied to both the Thiruvancode channel and the Main channel below the Adaya Madai and the Erattakarakal simultaneously, instead of alternately as at present.

Dewan's reply.—Noted.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly